

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 have been examined, all of which stand rejected. By the above amendments, claims 1, 6-10, 12, 17-19 and 21 are amended. Favorable reconsideration of the application and allowance of all of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Counsel wishes to thank the Examiner for his courtesies extended during the telephone discussion on July 24, 2007. During that discussion, counsel discussed, among other things, dependent claims 7 and 8 and the cited reference to Teller et al.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In the foregoing claim amendments, claims 1 and 12 are amended to clarify that the “storing” function is performed at the network server. Similar claim language appears in independent claims 8 and 19 (which claims have been rewritten as independent claims). Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-22 as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,605,038 to Teller et al. (“Teller”) in view of Japanese patent document number 05252068 to Murakami (“Murakami”).

The following summarizes the amendments made to the claims. Claim 1 has been amended to recite the subject matter of claims 6 and 7 (which previously depended from claim 1). Thus, claim 1 now recites that the receiving, capturing, periodically transmitting, storing, analyzing and posting functions are performed for personal data for each of a plurality of users received from their corresponding wireless communication devices. Claim 1 further recites that the analyzing function comprises comparing personal data for one user (said user) with personal data for at least one other user, and that the posting function comprises posting comparisons between the personal data of said user with personal data for said at least one other user.

Claims 2-5 remain dependent on claim 1.

Claim 6 is amended to depend from now independent claim 8.

Claim 7 remains dependent from claim 6.

Claim 8, which previously depended from claim 1, is now rewritten as an independent claim. Thus, claim 8 recites the receiving, capturing, periodically transmitting, storing, analyzing and posting functions (from claim 1), as well as the transmitting and display functions.

Claim 9 is amended to depend from claim 8.

Claim 10 is amended to correct an apparent antecedent basis issue.

Like claim 1, claim 12 is amended to include the subject matter of claims 17 and 18, and thus has a scope similar to claim 1 as amended herein.

Claim 17 is amended to depend from claim 19, which has been rewritten as an independent claim.

Claim 19, which previously depended from claim 12, is now rewritten as an independent claim and thus has a scope similar to claim 8 as amended herein.

Claim 21 is amended to correct an apparent antecedent basis issue.

Claims 20 and 22 remain unamended.

The following remarks are submitted with respect to the rejections made in the outstanding Office Action.

With regard to claims 1 and 12, these claims now recite that the:

receiving, capturing, periodically transmitting, storing, analyzing and posting functions are performed for personal data for each of a plurality of users received from their corresponding wireless communication devices;

the analyzing function comprises comparing personal data for one user (said user) with personal data for at least one other user; and

the posting function comprises posting comparisons between the personal data of said user with personal data for said at least one other user.

In amended claims 1 and 12, the antecedent issues raised by the Examiner during the telephone discussion on July 24, 2007 have been corrected as suggested by the Examiner.

The Office Action rejected claims 6 and 7 (the subject matter incorporated into claim 1) and claims 17 and 18 (the subject matter incorporated into claim 12) based on Teller in combination with Murakami. Counsel has carefully reviewed Teller and finds that FIGs. 5-10 of

Teller and the corresponding text in Teller does not teach making comparisons of personal data for one of a plurality of users with personal data for at least one other of the plurality of users. Nor does Teller teach posting comparisons between the personal data of said (one) user and the personal data of the at least one other user. For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 12 are patentable over the Teller-Murakami combination.

Claims 8 and 19 are rewritten as independent claims and as explained above, both of these claims recite that the feedback information is generated at the network server, the feedback information is posted on a web site that is accessible to a user, and the feedback information is transmitted from the network server to the user's device where it is displayed to the user.

In rejecting claims 8 and 19, the Office Action refers to column 7, lines 50-65 of Teller. There, Teller discloses that sensor data produced by one or more sensors is transmitted to a wireless device for subsequent outgoing transmission to a central monitoring facility. This disclosure in Teller is completely different from (and in fact the reverse of) the subject matter of claims 8 and 19. Claims 8 and 19 are directed to transmitting feedback information from a network server to a user's device where the feedback information is displayed to the user. In rewriting claims 8 and 19 as independent claims, care has been taken to clarify that the claim language clearly states that the feedback information is generated at the network server, and that the transmission of the feedback information is made from the network server to a user's device where it is displayed to the user. For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8 and 19 are patentable over and above the Teller-Murakami combination.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to find the application to be in condition for allowance with claims 1-22. However, if for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney to discuss any unresolved issues and to expedite the disposition of the application.

No claim fees are believed to be due. A Petition for Extension of Time requesting two additional months within which to respond is submitted herewith together with electronic payment of the applicable petition fee. Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time that

may be necessary to maintain the pendency of this application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees required for the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 05-0460.

Dated: October 16, 2007

Respectfully submitted by:

EDELL, SHAPIRO & FINNAN, LLC
CUSTOMER No. 27896
1901 Research Boulevard, Suite 400
Rockville, MD 20850
(301) 424-3640

/D. Andrew Floam/
D. Andrew Floam
Reg. No. 34597